

## CHAPTER 4

# QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

In July 1998 the research Core Group and The Newman Group, Ltd., met in a face-to-face meeting in Alexandria, VA to finalize the quantitative findings and implications, to discuss what was learned from the qualitative mini focus group research, and to discuss the overall conclusions for Phase II of the CLI.

As mentioned in Chapters 2 and 3, the *findings* result directly from the quantitative survey results and are supported by the quantitative data. *Implications* show connections among the various findings related to a topic or learning objective, and are derived from the quantitative findings. The formulation of *implications* involved a certain element of interpretation of the quantitative data, but they can be traced directly to the data. The *overall conclusions* of the Phase II research draw from findings and implications of the quantitative research, the information obtained during the qualitative mini focus group research, and all of the other Phase II activities (e.g., subgroup meetings, Stakeholder comments, First Aid qualitative research). *Conclusions* are broad statements, which the research Core Group developed as they interpreted these various sources of information and data, about product labels and consumers' comprehension, satisfaction, and preference for labels.

The conclusions from the Phase II quantitative and qualitative research are as follows:

1. There is no strong motivator that suggests fundamental label changes, but language and format can be improved. Consumers are generally satisfied with current labels and are able to find the information they want on the label. However, the data indicate that improvements would encourage more reading and use of product labels.
2. Labels for each of the product categories should not be treated in the same way since consumers perceive the products differently and have different label reading habits for each category, as follows —
  - ▶ *Household cleaner labels* should be simpler, with exceptional information (i.e., very important or different than anticipated) highlighted. There is a lower motivation to carefully read these labels because of the perceived familiarity with cleaning products.
  - ▶ *Indoor insecticide labels* are quite effective now. Incremental changes to simplify labels and make them easier to understand should be tested.
  - ▶ *Outdoor pesticide labels* are confusing because they are more complex and less frequently used, and therefore less familiar to consumers. They should be simplified and arranged for easier reading.

3. Consumers want clear, concise, easy-to-read information that connects consequences with actions. Instructions on labels should say ‘why’ and jargon should be avoided.
4. Consumers look to all traditional media to gain information. Therefore, outreach to consumers should incorporate traditional media, and should also include education efforts directed toward store personnel and other “influencers.”
5. Ingredient information can be communicated by name, type or category of ingredient, and purpose of ingredient, not just by a list of chemical names. Ingredients should be presented in tabular form, with flexibility as to where in the label they are located (e.g., front vs. back panel of the label).
6. Additional information is needed to better understand how to answer the need some consumers expressed for useful ingredient information. A full disclosure list of names does not further consumer understanding.

These conclusions are supported by detailed research findings.